REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Non-Final Office Action mailed April 12, 2010. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 41 – 78 remain pending. In particular, Applicants amend claims 46 and 74 – 78. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 46 for various informalities. Applicants amend claim 46, as indicated above, and submit that these amendments overcome this objection.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action indicates that claims 74 – 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants amend claims 74 – 78, as indicated above. Applicants submit that these amendments comply with the Office Action and that claims 74 – 78, as amended, fulfill all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claim 41 is Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 41. More specifically, claim 41 recites:

> A method for coupling a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both a remote network drive interface

specification and a non-network drive interface specification, the method performed by a network adapter, the method, comprising:

providing a plurality of universal serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network;

receiving a first request from a host, the host coupled to a device;

returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration from the network, the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a first computing platform;

determining whether an other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform;

receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration, ***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***;

returning a non-remote network drive interface specification configuration, where the host is configured to parse the received configuration to determine the configuration supported by the device and where the host is configured to select a configuration that matches a client driver.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 41 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "method for coupling a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both a remote network drive interface specification and a non-network drive interface specification, the method performed by a network adapter, the method, comprising… receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration, ***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***" as recited in claim 41. More specifically, the Office Action admits "Microsoft does not disclose providing a plurality of universal serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network; and determining whether an other configuration is supported… the request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration" (OA page 5, line 1).

Further, *Watanabe* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, as cited by the Office Action, *Watanabe* discloses "the DOS, VxWorks, and DR DOS operating systems are three examples of operating systems that could reside on a FAT partition, which partition could also serve as the compatible partition in a system that includes an operating system such as Windows NT, Linux, or Unix as the other operating systems, residing on a partition formatted with an organization different than FAT" (column 18, line 16). However, as clearly illustrated in this passage, *Watanabe* merely discloses using a plurality of operating systems on different partitions of a system. This has absolutely nothing to do with a request that is sent from a host, not to mention "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration, ***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***" as recited in claim 41.

Similarly, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of support of the other configuration, ***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***" as recited in claim 41. For at least these reasons, claim 41 is allowable.

B. Claim 46 is Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 46. More specifically, claim 46 recites:

> A method, at a host, for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising the steps of:
>
> detecting a network device, the network device operating on a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a first computing platform;
>
> issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device;
>
> sending the reset to the network device for resetting the state of the network device;
>
> ***rebooting the host to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with a second configuration***;
>
> ***issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform and compatible with the second computing platform***;
>
> issuing a first descriptor request enabling a retrieval of device descriptors from the network device;
>
> returning a device descriptor indicating a function of the network device; and
>
> issuing configuration commands, whereby, the network device is configured to return a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates multiple supported configurations, a second descriptor request is issued.
>
> ***(Emphasis added).***

Claim 46 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "method, at a host, for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising the steps of… ***rebooting the host to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with a second configuration*** [and]… ***issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform and compatible with the second computing platform***" as recited in claim 46. More specifically, the Office Action argues that *Microsoft* discloses "issuing a command enabling a

retrieval of device descriptors from the network device" (OA page 12, line 1). However, the Office Action never argues that *Microsoft* even suggests "***rebooting the host to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with a second configuration*** [and]*...* ***issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform and compatible with the second computing platform***" as recited in claim 46. Instead, the Office Action argues that *Watanabe*, addresses this deficiency by disclosing different computing platforms.

As illustrated, the fact that *Microsoft* (allegedly) discloses issuing a command that enables retrieval of descriptors and *Watanabe* (allegedly) discloses different computing platforms does not even approach a suggestion of "***rebooting the host to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with a second configuration*** [and]*...* ***issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform and compatible with the second computing platform***" as recited in claim 46. More specifically, there is nothing in either *Microsoft* or *Watanabe* reference that even suggests issuing a command to a network device to communication according to a second configuration. Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. For at least these reasons, the rejection is improper and claim 46 is allowable.

C. **Claim 52 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Watanabe*, and *Moroz***

The Office Action indicates that claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 52. More specifically, claim 52 recites:

> An apparatus for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:
> a universal serial bus network configured to receive a plurality of universal serial bus configurations;
> a receiving component configured to receive a first request from a network adapter;
> a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, the remote network drive interface specification configuration being configured to operate with a first computing platform, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host when there is an indication of support of an other configuration, ***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***;
> a parsing component for parsing all the received configuration to determine the configuration supported by the device; and
> wherein the host selects the configuration that matches a client driver.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 52 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests an "apparatus for coupling universal serial bus devices network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… ***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration, the other***

configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform" as recited in claim 52. More specifically, the Office Action admits "Microsoft does not disclose providing a plurality of universal serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network; and determining whether an other configuration is supported... the request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration" (OA page 5, line 1).

Further, *Watanabe* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, as cited by the Office Action, *Watanabe* discloses "the DOS, VxWorks, and DR DOS operating systems are three examples of operating systems that could reside on a FAT partition, which partition could also serve as the compatible partition in a system that includes an operating system such as Windows NT, Linux, or Unix as the other operating systems, residing on a partition formatted with an organization different than FAT" (column 18, line 16). However, as clearly illustrated in this passage, *Watanabe* merely discloses using a plurality of operating systems on different partitions of a system. This has absolutely nothing to do with a request that is sent from a host, not to mention "***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***" as recited in claim 52.

Similarly, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "***the second request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration, the other configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***" as recited in claim 52. For at least these reasons, claim 52 is allowable.

D. Claim 57 is Allowable Over *Microsoft, Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 57 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 57. More specifically, claim 57 recites:

> An apparatus for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:
>
> a detecting component configured to detect a network device communicating via a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a first computing platform, and for issuing a universal serial bus reset to a network device by a host, and resetting a state of the network device, and for receiving a network device at a universal serial bus port;
>
> ***a first issuing component configured to issue a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus via a second configuration after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***;
>
> a second issuing component configured to issue a first descriptor request for retrieving device descriptors from the network device; and
>
> a third issuing component configured to issue configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates that an other configuration is supported, the other configuration being incompatible with the computing platform, a second descriptor request is issued.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 57 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests an "apparatus for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… ***a first issuing component configured to issue a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus via a second configuration after a host reboot***

to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration" as recited in claim 57. More specifically, the Office Action argues that *Microsoft* discloses "issuing a command enabling a retrieval of device descriptors from the network device" (OA page 12, line 1). However, the Office Action never argues that *Microsoft* even suggests "***a first issuing component configured to issue a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus via a second configuration after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***" as recited in claim 57. Instead, the Office Action argues that *Watanabe*, addresses this deficiency by disclosing different computing platforms.

As illustrated, the fact that *Microsoft* (allegedly) discloses issuing a command that enables retrieval of descriptors and *Watanabe* (allegedly) discloses different computing platforms does not even approach a suggestion of "***a first issuing component configured to issue a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus via a second configuration after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration***" as recited in claim 57. More specifically, there is nothing in either *Microsoft* or *Watanabe* reference that even suggests issuing a command to a network device to communication according to a second configuration. Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. For at least these reasons, the rejection is improper and claim 57 is allowable.

E. Claim 63 is Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 63 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 63. More specifically, claim 63 recites:

> A system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:
>
> a providing component configured to provide two universal serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network;
>
> a first receiving component configured to receive a first request from a host;
>
> a first returning component configured to return a remote network drive interface specification configuration that is configured to operate with a first computing platform from the network adapter;
>
> ***a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported***;
>
> a second returning component configured to return a non-remote network drive interface specification configuration from the network adapter, after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration;
>
> a parsing component configured to parse all the received configuration to determine the configuration supported by the device; and
>
> a selecting component configured to select a configuration that matches a client driver.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 63 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… ***a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported***" as recited in claim 63. More specifically, the Office Action admits "Microsoft does not disclose providing a plurality of universal serial bus configurations to a universal serial bus network; and determining whether an other configuration is supported… the

request being sent from the host after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the other configuration" (OA page 5, line 1).

Further, *Watanabe* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, as cited by the Office Action, *Watanabe* discloses "the DOS, VxWorks, and DR DOS operating systems are three examples of operating systems that could reside on a FAT partition, which partition could also serve as the compatible partition in a system that includes an operating system such as Windows NT, Linux, or Unix as the other operating systems, residing on a partition formatted with an organization different than FAT" (column 18, line 16). However, as clearly illustrated in this passage, *Watanabe* merely discloses using a plurality of operating systems on different partitions of a system. This has absolutely nothing to do with a request that is sent from a host, not to mention "***a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported***" as recited in claim 63.

Similarly, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. More specifically, *Moroz* discloses a "universal docking station for connecting a portable computer to a plurality of peripheral devices" (page 1, paragraph [0007]). However, this is completely different than "***a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, when there is an indication that an other configuration that is incompatible with the computing platform is supported***" as recited in claim 63. For at least these reasons, claim 63 is allowable.

F. Claim 68 is Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 68 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458

("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 68. More specifically, claim 68 recites:

> A system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising:
>
> a universal serial bus port configured to receive a network device according to a first configuration that is configured to operate with a first computing platform;
>
> a detecting component configured to detect the network device coupled to the universal serial bus port;
>
> a first issuing component configured to issue a universal serial bus reset to the network device to reset the state of the network device;
>
> a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***;
>
> a third issuing component configured to issue a first descriptor request to retrieve device descriptors from the network device;
>
> a receiving component configured to receive a device descriptor listing indicating its function from the network device; and
>
> a fourth issuing component configured to issue configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates multiple supported configurations, a second descriptor request is issued.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 68 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "system for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, comprising… a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second***

configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform" as recited in claim 68. More specifically, the Office Action argues that *Microsoft* discloses "issuing a command enabling a retrieval of device descriptors from the network device" (OA page 12, line 1). However, the Office Action never argues that *Microsoft* even suggests "a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***" as recited in claim 68. Instead, the Office Action argues that *Watanabe*, addresses this deficiency by disclosing different computing platforms.

As illustrated, the fact that *Microsoft* (allegedly) discloses issuing a command that enables retrieval of descriptors and *Watanabe* (allegedly) discloses different computing platforms does not even approach a suggestion of "a second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***" as recited in claim 68. More specifically, there is nothing in either *Microsoft* or *Watanabe* reference that even suggests issuing a command to a network device to communication according to a second configuration. Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. For at least these reasons, the rejection is improper and claim 68 is allowable.

G. Claim 74 is Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claim 74 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458

("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 74. More specifically, claim 74 recites:

> A non-transitory computer-readable media containing a computer-executable program for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, the program comprising:
>
> one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the network device operating to a first configuration, the first configuration being configured to operate with a first computing platform;
>
> one or more instructions for resetting the state of the network device;
>
> one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***;
>
> one or more instructions for issuing by the host a first descriptor request enabling to retrieve device descriptors from the network device;
>
> one or more instructions for returning by the network device a computer code device descriptor indicating its function; and
>
> one or more instructions for issuing by the host configuration commands, whereby, the network device returns a list of descriptors, wherein in response to a determination that at least one of the descriptors indicates multiple supported configurations, a second descriptor request is issued.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 74 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "non-transitory computer-readable media containing a computer-executable program for attaching a universal serial bus network adapter supporting both remote network drive interface specification and non-network drive interface specification, the program comprising… one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration***

being incompatible with the first computing platform" as recited in claim 74. More specifically, the Office Action argues that *Microsoft* discloses "issuing a command enabling a retrieval of device descriptors from the network device" (OA page 12, line 1). However, the Office Action never argues that *Microsoft* even suggests "one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***" as recited in claim 74. Instead, the Office Action argues that *Watanabe* discloses different computing platforms.

As illustrated, the fact that *Microsoft* (allegedly) discloses issuing a command that enables retrieval of descriptors and *Watanabe* (allegedly) discloses different computing platforms does not even approach a suggestion of "one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second configuration, ***after a host reboot to activate a second computing platform that is compatible with the second configuration, the second configuration being incompatible with the first computing platform***" as recited in claim 74. More specifically, there is nothing in either (or both) reference that even suggests issuing a command to a network device to communication according to a second configuration. Further, *Moroz* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Watanabe*. For at least these reasons, the rejection is improper and claim 74 is allowable.

H. Claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 53, 55, 56, 60, 64, 66, 67, 71, and 76 are Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, and *Moroz*

The Office Action indicates that claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 53, 55, 56, 60, 64, 66, 67, 71, and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), and

further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*") and U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* in view of *Watanabe* and *Moroz* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 53, 55, 56, 60, 64, 66, 67, 71, and 76. More specifically, dependent claims 42, 44, and 45 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 41. Dependent claim 49 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 46. Dependent claims 53, 55, and 56 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 52. Dependent claim 60 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 57. Dependent claims 64, 66, and 67 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 63. Dependent claim 71 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 68. Further, dependent claim 76 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 74. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

I. Claims 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, and 78 are Allowable Over *Microsoft*, *Watanabe*, *Moroz*, and *Brownell*

The Office Action indicates that claims 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Non-Patent Literature from Microsoft entitled "USB Remote NFIS Devices and Windows" ("*Microsoft*"), U.S. Patent Number 6,763,458 ("*Watanabe*"), U.S. Publication Number 2001/0042150 ("*Moroz*"), and further in view of Non-Patent Literature from Brownell and Machek on USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection

for at least the reason that *Microsoft, Watanabe,* and *Moroz* in view of *Brownell* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, and 78. More specifically, dependent claim 43 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 41. Dependent claims 47, 48, 50, and 51 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 46. Dependent claim 54 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 52. Dependent claims 58, 59, 61, and 62 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 57. Dependent claim 65 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 63. Dependent claims 69, 70, 72, and 73 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 68. Further, dependent claims 75, 77, and 78 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 74. Because *Brownell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft, Watanabe,* and *Moroz*, claims 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 54, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, and 78 are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Jeffrey Hsu /
Jeffrey C. Hsu
Reg. No. 63,063

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway SE
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500